arXiv:1403.1830v1 [stat.ME] 7 Mar 2014

A short note on model selection by LASSO methods in a change-point model

Fuqi Chen* and Sévérien Nkurunziza†

Abstract

In Ciuperca (2012) (Ciuperca. Model selection by LASSO methods in a change-point model, *Stat. Papers*, 2012;(in press)), the author considered a linear regression model with multiple change-points occurring at unknown times. In particular, the author studied the asymptotic properties of the LASSO-type and of the adaptive LASSO estimators. While the established results seem interesting, we point out some major errors in proof of the most important result of the quoted paper. Further, we present a corrected result and proof.

Keywords: Asymptotic properties; Change-points; Model selection; LASSO; Regression.

*University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4. Email: chen111n@uwindsor.ca

†University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4. Email: severien@uwindsor.ca

1 Introduction

In Ciuperca (2012), the author considered a linear regression model with multiple change-points occurring at unknown times. In particular, the author studied the asymptotic properties of the LASSO-type and that of the adaptive LASSO estimators. While the established results seem interesting, we point out a major error in proof of one of the important result. In particular, the proof of Part (ii) of Lemma 3 in Ciuperca (2011) is based on the inequality $|a^2-b^2| \leqslant (a-b)^2$, which is wrong. Indeed, take $a=2$ and $b=1$, we get $|a^2-b^2|=3>(2-1)^2=1$ which contradicts the inequality used in the quoted paper.

For the sake of clarity, we use the same notation and we suppose that the main assumptions in Ciuperca (2012) hold. Below, we recall these assumptions for the convenience of the reader. Namely, we consider the following model: $Y_i = f_\theta(X_i)+\varepsilon_i$, where

$$f_\theta(X_i) = X_i'\phi_1\mathbb{I}_{\{i<l_1\}} + X_i'\phi_2\mathbb{I}_{\{l_1\leq i<l_2\}} + ... + X_i'\phi_{K+1}\mathbb{I}_{\{i>l_K\}}, \quad i=1,...n,$$

$\mathbb{I}_A$ denotes the indicator function of the event A, Y_i denotes the response variable, X_i is a p-vector of regressors, $(\varepsilon_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ are the errors which are assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, $\phi_i \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, Γ is compact, $i=1,2,\ldots,K$. The model parameters are given by $\theta=(\theta_1,\theta_2)$, with the regression parameters $\theta_1 = (\phi_1,...\phi_{k+1})$ and the change-points $\theta_2=(l_1,...,l_k)$. In addition, we set $\theta_1^0=(\phi_1^0,...\phi_{k+1}^0)$ and $\theta_2^0=(l_1^0,...,l_k^0)$ to be the true values of θ_1 and θ_2, respectively. As in Ciuperca (2012), we impose the following conditions.

Main Assumptions

$(\boldsymbol{H}_1)$ There exists two positive constants $u, c_0(>0)$ such that $l_{r+1} - l_r \geqslant c_0[n^u]$, for every $r \in (1,...,K)$, with $l_0 = 1$ and $l_{K+1} = n$. Without loss of generality, we consider $3/4 \leqslant u \leqslant 1$, and $c_0 = 1$.

$(\boldsymbol{H}_2)$ $n^{-1} \max\limits_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} (X_i' X_i) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathbf{0}$ and for any $r = 1,...,K+1$, the matrix $C_{n,r} \equiv (l_r - l_{r-1}) \sum\limits_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} X_i X_i' \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} C_r$, where C_r is a non-negative definite matrix.

$(\boldsymbol{H}_3)$ ε is a random variable absolutely continuous with $\mathrm{E}(\varepsilon_i) = 0$, $\mathrm{E}(\varepsilon_i^2) = \sigma^2$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

We assume that $\phi_r \neq \phi_{r+1}$, $r = 1,...,k$, and consider the following penalized sum:

$$S(l_1,...,l_k) = \sum_{r=1}^{k+1} \Big[\inf_{\phi_r} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \Big(((Y_i - X_i\phi_r)^2) + \frac{\lambda_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}}{l_r - l_{r-1}} \sum_{u=1}^{P} |\phi_{r,u}|^\gamma \Big) \Big],$$

where $\lambda_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)} = O(l_r - l_{r-1})^{1/2}$ is the tuning parameter and $\gamma > 0$. We define the LASSO-type estimator of (θ_1^0, θ_2^0), say $(\hat{\theta}_1^s, \hat{\theta}_2^s)$, where $\hat{\theta}_1^s = (\hat{l}_1^s, ..., \hat{l}_k^s)$ and $\hat{\theta}_2^s = (\hat{\phi}_1^s, ..., \hat{\phi}_{k+1}^s)$, by

$$\hat{\phi}_r^s = \arg\min_{\phi_r} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \Big((Y_i - X_i\phi_r)^2) + \frac{\lambda_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}}{l_r - l_{r-1}} \sum_{u=1}^{P} |\phi_{r,u}|^\gamma \Big), \quad \forall r = 1,...,k+1,$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_1^s = \arg\min_{\theta_1} S(l_1,...,l_k).$$

Note that, for $\gamma = 1$ and $\gamma = 2$, we obtain the LASSO estimator and ridge estimator respectively.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the main result of this paper, and in Section 3. The proof of the main result is given in the Appendix.

2 Main result

Lemma 2.1. *Under Assumptions* $(\boldsymbol{H}_2)$, $(\boldsymbol{H}_3)$, *for all* n_1, $n_2 \in N$, *such that* $n_1 \geqslant n^u$, *with* $3/4 \leq u \leq 1$, $n_2 \leq n^v$, $v < 1/4$, *let be the model:*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &= X_i'\phi_1^0 + \varepsilon_i,\ i = 1, ..., n_1 \\ Y_i &= X_i'\phi_2^0 + \varepsilon_i,\ i = n_1+1, ..., n_2, \end{aligned}$$

with $\phi_1^0 \neq \phi_2^0$. *We set* $A^s_{n_1+n_2}(\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta^s_{i;(0,n_1)}(\phi, \phi_1^0) + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \eta^s_{i;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}(\phi, \phi_2^0)$ *and* $\hat{\phi}^s_{n_1+n_2} = \arg\min_{\phi} A^s_{n_1+n_2}(\phi)$. *Let* $\delta \in (0, u-3v)$. *Then,*

(i) $||\hat{\phi}^s_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0|| \leq n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}$.

(ii) If $\phi_2^0 = \phi_1^0 + \phi_3^0 n^{-1/4}$ *for some* ϕ_3^0, *then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta^s_{i;(0,n_1)}(\phi^s_{n_1+n_2}, \phi_1^0) = O_p(1).$$

Remark 2.1. *It should be noted that, although Part (i) of the above lemma is the same as that of lemma 3 of Ciuperca (2012), Part (ii) is slightly different. The established result holds if* $\phi_2^0 = \phi_1^0 + \phi_3^0 n^{-1/4}$, *while the result stated in Ciuperca (2012) is supposed to hold for all* $\phi_2^0 \neq \phi_1^0$, *but with incorrect proof. So far, we are neither able to correct the proof for all* $\phi_2^0 \neq \phi_1^0$ *nor to prove that the statement itself is wrong. Similarly, Part (ii) of Lemmas 4 and 8 hold under the condition that* $\phi_2^0 = \phi_1^0 + \phi_3^0 n^{-1/4}$.

3 Concluding Remark

In this paper, we proposed a modification of Part (ii) of Lemma 3 given in Ciuperca (2012) for which the proof is wrong. Further, we provided the correct proof. It should be noted

that there are several important results in the quoted paper which were established by using Lemma 3. In particular, the quoted author used this lemma in establishing Lemmas 4 and 8, as well as Theorems 1, 2 and 4.

A Appendix

Proof of Lemma 2.1. (i) The proof of Part (i) is similar to that in Ciuperca (2012).

(ii) Let $Z_n(\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta_i(\phi, \phi_1^0)$, $t_n(\phi) = \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} [(\varepsilon_i - X_i'(\phi - \phi_2^0))^2 - (\varepsilon_i - X_i'(\phi_1 - \phi_2^0))^2]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})| &= |-2\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \varepsilon_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0) + (\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_2^0)' \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_2^0) \\ &\quad -(\phi_1^0 - \phi_2^0)' \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'(\phi_1^0 - \phi_2^0)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $||\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0|| \leq n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}$, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \varepsilon_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0)| \leqslant O(n^{v/2} n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}) = o(1).$$

Further, let $\lambda_{\max}$ be the largest eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{n_2}\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'$. Then, using the fact that $\phi_2^0 = \phi_1^0 + \phi_3^0 n^{-1/4}$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_2^0)' \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_2^0) \\ = \; & (\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0)' n_2 \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0) - 2\phi_3^{0'} n^{-1/4} n_2 \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0) \\ & + n^{-1/2} \phi_3^{0'} n_2 \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} X_i X_i' \phi_3^0 \\ \leqslant \; & n_2 \lambda_{\max} ||\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0||^2 + 2||\phi_3^0|| n^{-1/4} n_2 \lambda_{\max} ||\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2} - \phi_1^0|| + n^{-1/2} n_2 \lambda_{\max} ||\phi_3^0||^2, \end{aligned}$$

and then,

$$(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}-\phi_2^0)'\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}X_iX_i'(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}-\phi_2^0)=O(n^{(u-v-\delta)}n^v)+o(1)+O(n^{v-1/2})=o(1).$$

Also, we have

$$(\phi_1^0-\phi_2^0)'\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}X_iX_i'(\phi_1^0-\phi_2^0)=n^{-1/2}\phi_3^{0\prime}\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}X_iX_i'\phi_3^0=O(n^{v-1/2})=o(1).$$

Therefore, $|t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|=o_p(1)$. Further, since

$Z_n(\phi_1^0)=t_n(\phi_1^0)=0$, $Z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})+t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})\leqslant Z_n(\phi_1^0)+t_n(\phi_1^0)$, we have

$$0\geqslant z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})+t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})\geqslant \inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)-|t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|=\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)-|o_p(1)|.$$

Hence

$$|z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|-|t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|\leqslant|z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})+t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|\leqslant|\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)|+o_p(1),$$

which implies that

$$|z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|\leqslant|\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)|+o_p(1)+|t_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|=|\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)|+o_p(1).$$

Let $\hat{\phi}_{n_1}=\arg\min_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)$ and $\lambda_{\max}$ be the largest eigenvalue of $n_1^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}X_iX_i'$. Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)\leqslant\left(\sqrt{n_1}\left\|\hat{\phi}_{n_1}-\phi_1^0\right\|\right)^2\lambda_{\max}+2\sqrt{n_1}\left|(\hat{\phi}_{n_1}-\phi_1^0)'n_1^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}\varepsilon_iX_i\right|,$$

and then,

$$\inf_{\phi}Z_n(\phi)=O_p(1)+O_p(1)O_p(1)=O_p(1),\quad\text{and}\quad|z_n(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2})|=O_p(1).$$

Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^s(\phi) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta_i(\phi,\phi_1^0) + \lambda_{n;(0,n_1)}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{,k}|^\gamma - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^\gamma)] \\ t_n^s(\phi) &= \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} [(\varepsilon_i - X_i'(\phi-\phi_2^0))^2 - (\varepsilon_i - X_i'(\phi_1-\phi_2^0))^2] \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{,k}|^\gamma - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^\gamma)]. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$A_{n_1+n_2}^s(\phi) = Z_n^s(\phi) + t_n^s(\phi) - (\varepsilon_i - X_i'(\phi_1-\phi_2^0))^2 + \lambda_{n;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{1,k}^0|^\gamma - |\phi_{2,k}^0|^\gamma)].$$

Then $\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s = \arg\min_\phi (Z_n^s(\phi) + t_n^s(\phi)) = \arg\min_\phi A_{n_1+n_2}^s(\phi)$. In addition, using the similar approach as previous, with the fact that $||\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s - \phi_1^0|| \leqslant n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}$ and $\phi_2^0 = \phi_1^0 + \phi_3^0 n^{-1/4}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |t_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s)| &\leqslant o(1) + \lambda_{n;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2,k}^s|^\gamma - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^\gamma)] \\ &= o_p(1) + O(n^{v/2})O_p(||\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s - \phi_1^0||) = O_p(n^{-(u-2v-\delta)/2}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Besides, $Z_n^s(\phi_1^0) = t_n^s(\phi_1^0) = 0$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geqslant \inf_\phi (Z_n^s(\phi_1^0) + t_n^s(\phi_1^0)) = Z_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s) + t_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s) &= Z_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s) - |o_p(1)| \\ &\geqslant \inf_\phi Z_n^s(\phi) - |o_p(1)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|Z_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s)| \leqslant |\inf_\phi Z_n^s(\phi)| + o_p(1).$$

On the other hand, since

$$0 \geqslant \inf_\phi Z_n^s(\phi) \geqslant \inf_\phi Z_n(\phi) + \lambda_{n;(0,n_1)} \inf_\phi [\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{,k}|^\gamma - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^\gamma)],$$

$$|\inf_{\phi} Z_n^s(\phi)| \leqslant |\inf_{\phi} Z_n(\phi)| + |\lambda_{n;(0,n_1)} \inf_{\phi}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{,k}|^{\gamma} - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^{\gamma})]|.$$

Further,

$$\inf_{\phi}[\sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\phi_{,k}|^{\gamma} - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^{\gamma})] \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{p}(|\hat{\phi}_{n_1,k}|^{\gamma} - |\phi_{1,k}^0|^{\gamma}) = O_p(||\hat{\phi}_{n_1} - \phi_1^0||) = O_p(n_1^{-1/2}),$$

and $\inf_{\phi} Z_n(\phi) = O_p(1)$. It follows that $|\inf_{\phi} Z_n^s(\phi)| \leqslant O_p(1)$. Hence,

$$|Z_n^s(\hat{\phi}_{n_1+n_2}^s)| \leqslant |\inf_{\phi} Z_n^s(\phi)| + o_p(1) = O_p(1).$$

□

References

[1] Ciuperca, G. (2012). Model selection by LASSO methods in a change-point model.

Stat Papers, DOI: 10.1007/s00362-012-0482-x (in press).